

From:Thomson, Ian[EX:/O=NZGOVT/OU=CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=IAN.THOMSON]  
To:Filsell, John[EX:/O=NZGOVT/OU=CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JOHN.FILSELL]  
Received-Date:20120924  
Received-Time:2:54:37 AM  
Sent-Date:20120924  
Sent-Time:2:54:37 AM  
Subject:RE: RSU Hagley Oval Cricket Council Report 28 08 2012.DOC

John,

I concur,so far as the the first point is concerned.

And for the second point(this is worrying!)as well. The Council has to approve the statement of proposal that will go out for consultation,but we can't prepare that until a decision is made as to which option is to be consulted on.

There is one other point that I meant to raise with you last week. We may get asked to release the information that staff relied on when in 2008 they recommended QE II as the preferred option. This included the report from external consultants,marked "confidential".

It is likely that the Office of the Ombudsmen would recommend that the report be made publicly available,if asked to investigate any decision made by the Council to withhold that information. Are you prepared for this?

Happy to discuss.

Regards

Ian

-----Original Message-----

From: Filsell, John  
Sent: Monday, 24 September 2012 12:19 PM  
To: Thomson, Ian  
Subject: FW: RSU Hagley Oval Cricket Council Report 28 08 2012.DOC

Hi Ian

I agree with Derek on his first point but not his second over the recommendations

John Filsell  
Recreation & Sports Manager  
Direct dial 941 8303  
Mobile 027 444 8796  
Fax 941 8267  
PO Box 73016 Christchurch 8154  
Email john.filsell@ccc.govt.nz

One team making it happen with integrity & passion

-----Original Message-----

From: Roozen, Derek

Sent: Monday, 24 September 2012 11:43 AM

To: Filsell, John

Cc: Hawker, Jeremy; MacGibbon, Peter; Thomson, Ian; Bullock, John; Beuzenberg, Alan; Collier, Kevin; Graham, Stuart; O'Connor, Robert; Allen, John; Smith, Brent; Hamilton, Jennie  
Subject: RE: RSU Hagley Oval Cricket Council Report 28 08 2012.DOC

Hi John,

To reiterate what I said verbally this morning, I really do think we should not be getting the Council to resolve to "... establish a commitment to remove non-essential built infrastructure from the area over time..." because that may unduly prevent the ability of the Council in the future to make the decision to approve appropriate and needed new buildings on Hagley Park. The Hagley Park Management Plan already has an objective "To keep to a minimum the number of new buildings and structures on Hagley Park...", the Hagley Park/Botanic Gardens Master Plan has a project (Project 12) to consider the removal of existing un-needed buildings on the Park, and the City Plan Open Space Rules control the extent of space to be occupied by buildings on parks. I think the reference in the report should just stay at highlighting that, as part of BAU good planning and management of Hagley Park, the aforementioned documented provisions are already taken on board. Therefore, Option 2 description should be amended to remove reference to any such commitment.

One other thing, now looking at and thinking about the report further - with respect to the report recommendations:

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council resolves that it;

- (a) consults with the community in respect of option 2,
- (b) uses the special consultative procedure for this process, and
- (c) requests staff to prepare the documentation required and to bring it back to the Council for approval.

I think these are not clear. The sole purpose of this report is to ask the Council to select the option 2 development (the other option being to do nothing more than what is currently happening with the works on the Oval) as a way forward. I don't think we can ask them to approve consultation with the community until they have seen the detail proposed to go out. Also, I think it goes without saying that the consultation process (if, in fact, it will be consulted on!) will be a rigorous and thorough one and that we don't need to ask the Council to approve a particular statutory consultation process - furthermore, the section 54 Reserves Act required process would be applying also - so if the resolution mentions the LGA process, then it should also mention the RA, and RMA, processes as well.

So, my suggestion for a recommendation is as follows:

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Council resolves to:

(a) Adopt option 2, as specified in paragraph 64 of this report, as the proposed development to proceed with on Hagley Oval.

(b) Request staff to report back with the necessary detail of the proposed development to be approved to be released for public consultation.

Still possibly a bit crude and need some further working on but I think it shows what I am trying to suggest.

Best regards,

Derek

Derek Roozen

Parks & Waterways Planner  
Asset & Network Planning, City Environment

DDI 03 941 8798  
Fax 03 941 8384  
Email [derek.roozen@ccc.govt.nz](mailto:derek.roozen@ccc.govt.nz)  
Web [www.ccc.govt.nz](http://www.ccc.govt.nz)

Christchurch City Council  
Civic Offices, 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch PO Box 73014, Christchurch, 8154

Please consider the environment before printing this email

-----Original Message-----

From: Filsell, John

Sent: Friday, 21 September 2012 3:13 PM

To: Hawker, Jeremy; MacGibbon, Peter; Rivett, Jason; Thomson, Ian; Roozen, Derek; Bullock, John

Cc: Beuzenberg, Alan; Collier, Kevin; Wisneski, Warren; Graham, Stuart

Subject: RSU Hagley Oval Cricket Council Report 28 08 2012.DOC

Hi All

Please find the Hagley report attached in final draft format. Can you give it a read by close of business Monday and give me your feedback. If this email is copied to you I don't expect feedback but it would be nice. I want to get it to the secretariat on Wednesday morning. We are asking Council to commit to a decision making process around a preferred option.

For you purists the trim link is 12/654835 but I ask that you not change the report on Trim so I can manage version control.

When this is over it is my shout

John